Subject: Re: [PATCH] Fix OOPS in show_uevent() Posted by Cornelia Huck on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 13:37:28 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Fri, 10 Aug 2007 17:21:51 +0400,
Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:
> Cornelia Huck wrote:
> > On Fri, 10 Aug 2007 14:23:56 +0200,
> > "Kay Sievers" <kay.sievers@vrfy.org> wrote:
> >
>>> But we still don't update the remaining buffer size and the remaining
>>> array fields which are left after the call. Shouldn't we instead just
> >> change the:
      int (*dev_uevent)(struct device *dev,
> >>
                         char **envp, int num_envp,
> >>
                         char *buffer, int buffer size);
> >>
> >> to:
      int (*dev uevent)(struct device *dev,
                         char **envp, int num_envp, int *cur_index,
> >>
                         char *buffer, int buffer size, int *cur len);
> >>
> >>
> >> like we do for:
     int add_uevent_var(char **envp, int num_envp, int *cur_index,
> >>
                           char *buffer, int buffer_size, int *cur_len,
> >>
                           const char *format, ...)
> >>
> >>
>>> and along with the change of the callers, we would update the values
>>> properly, so the next call has the correct numbers? There are 6
>>> classes and something like 12 buses using this method, so it shouldn't
>>> be too much trouble.
>
> isn't it better to change
    int (*dev_uevent)(struct device *dev,
                       char **envp, int num_envp,
>
                       char *buffer, int buffer_size);
>
> to
    int (*dev uevent)(struct device *dev,
>
                       char **envp, int num_envp,
>
                       char **buffer);
>
> and alter the buffer pointer inside?
But the function wants to know the buffer size, doesn't it?
```

(And the caller can make the adjustments easily; it saves duplicated

code.)